

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER EDUCATION FOUNDATION

**717 H Street, Suite 317
Sacramento, CA 95814**

--ooOoo--

BAY DELTA CONSERVATION PLAN MEETINGS

PUBLIC COMMENTS ONLY

FOR:

STOCKTON

Stockton:

Chair: I'm sorry if I mispronounce anyone's name. Just correct me and tell me what it actually is. Mel Lidel, San Joaquin County, Donte Nomalini, Jr., and Mike Robinson. So if you three would come up first. And the microphone is right there.

Mr. Lidel: Okay, is that better? My name is Mel Lidel. I'm the Water Resource Coordinator for San Joaquin County. And I'd like to just start out by tonight thanking you for the opportunity to give a few comments. San Joaquin County I think is very much interested in this process and we'll be supplying written comments as well as my oral comments as well. Just to remind this group that the San Joaquin Board of Supervisors over the last number of years has been very much interested in the issues of a Peripheral Canal being installed and constructed in San Joaquin County. And by the process of the BDCP it looks like this alternative is one that's going to be looked at in great detail, and so we want to make sure that our position on this issue is taken in consideration as well as the alternatives that we address. Just for your review, in 1982 the Board of Supervisors passed a resolution opposing the Peripheral Canal as it was first developed. Also again during the Cal Fed Process, the

canal was again opposed in 1992, and again in 1998. Part of the resolution that was recently passed in 2007 brought forth the issue that the state water project has failed to develop the \$5 million acre feet necessary that was promised during the state water project as it was developed from north coast to watersheds. And we feel that that is a very key issue regarding the issues in the Delta primarily due to lack of supply. Conveyance of a new Peripheral Canal does nothing to provide additional supply for the State of California. We feel that that's a very strong thing that we need to look at. Peripheral Canal in San Joaquin County as the supervisors recently developed an additional resolution in 2007 where they again opposed the idea of a peripheral canal being constructed, as well as any isolated conveyance facility -- or dual conveyance facility in the Delta. The construction and operation of a peripheral canal are similar. A facility would require the taking of primary agricultural land and possibly urban areas for the construction of a itself based on its current alignments and the loss of additional acreage from seepage from the canal could cause some severage damage to additional prime agricultural land and sever the impaired utilities, local road systems, and would create significant flood dangers to agricultural

lands in urban areas within the City of Stockton and San Joaquin County, and various other communities. It would adversely affect water rights from water users in San Joaquin County and would circumvent the Delta common pool, and will seriously impair Delta water quality and adequate supply for all beneficial uses here in San Joaquin County. I've got 10 seconds left. Have I gone over 10? Oh, sorry about that.

Chair: That's all right.

Mr. Lidel: Other than that, we think there's some more viable alternatives that would allow for this sort of thing to happen. We'll supply those comments as part of our written comments to you due on May 30th.

Chair: Thank you very much. You don't have to go in order if you don't want.

Mr. Nomalini: Yeah -- Donte Nomalini, Jr., on behalf of the Central Delta Water Agency. And I'll be helping to provide a lot more detailed comments. But just at this juncture one thing that struck me is I don't know how you folks are going to come out with a preferred alternative. I know you will, and I know what it will include, but this is from the Delta Vision Report. I would caution you not to come out with a preferred alternative. Cal Fed I think came out and

just had a bunch of alternatives, then they went back and picked one, but from the Delta Vision -- you know -- it sounds like your preferred alternative is going to be a dual facility. They acknowledge -- this is on November 2007 -- perhaps an isolated facility would enhance the reliability of exports. Perhaps it would create fewer problems for selected species. Perhaps it would be less exposed to seismic risk. And perhaps it would result in higher water quality. But at this point, there's not sufficient specific information to guarantee these outcomes. Same with the dual conveyance, it might increase reliability, and it might capture more high water flows, but again, not enough information is available at this point to ensure this. So -- I mean -- I think it's -- you know -- borderline bad faith to be coming out saying we prefer -- this is our preferred approach to handle this when the information clearly doesn't appear to be there to back it up. So I would say keep your options open. And you're going to hear a lot more of that the Central Delta Water Agency absolutely 100% against any canal and we'll fight it to the end. Just another comment on the objectives, the Cal Fed EIR, there's a huge battle over what were and were not the objectives. So this go around, I would beg and ask that you folks try and be clear

on what are your projects basic objectives, so we don't have to fight over it. And of course, your objectives define what your alternatives are, so it's important that they are clear and that they are not unfairly or narrowly construed when it comes time to reject in alternative approaches. Because you're going to probably get several hundred alternative approaches and Cal Fed, we felt they narrowly interpreted their objectives and rejected alternatives which were on their face clearly consistent with the broad based objectives. Um -- just running out of time here. I would just like to say the common pool, whoever thought of that was a genius to have the projects depend on the same water quality as the Delta fisheries, the Delta farmers, the Delta commercial folks -- to have everybody draw out of the same pool was genius. You folks out there who care about the fish, us who care about the fish, as well as farming, you get that canal built and those projects no longer are going to care. That's the state and federal government with all their power and resources now do not care about the water quality. And the fishery folks, as well as us in the Delta, we're doomed. That's a bad, bad alternative. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. On deck we have Vince Wong, Steve Moore, and Donte John Nomalini. Go ahead.

Mr. Robinson: Uh -- Mike Robinson, the organization is Restore the Delta. We understand that there are many factors that may be contributing to the declines in the Delta. But we are concerned about the quantity of exports, and to a lesser degree about the timing of those exports. No one has determined the water needs of the Delta, and already we are 5 million acre feet short of promised water from North Coast rivers that was eliminated from the supply equation. Exports in the same time frame exports have continued to increase. Supply has not. Exports were supposed to be surplus water, those waters not needed to maintain the Delta. In the big picture we feel that all diversions need to be evaluated. All diversions that -- diversions that used to flow into the Delta, back to the original. How can you improve the system of the Delta by taking fresh water -- more fresh water -- Sacramento River water away from the Delta. The Delta needs more water, not less water in the system flowing through it. We're opposed to any type of isolated facility, and there are other alternatives in our opinion that would work better. We ask that you read and understand the original contracts of water exports. They

are very specific about what water was to be used for export. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Wong: My name is Vincent Wong. I'm with Zone 7 of Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation district. Sometimes known as the Zone 7 Water Agency. Zone 7 provides wholesale water and we manage local and ground water for 2,000 residents in Livermore, Pleasanton, and Dublin in Eastern Alameda County. We have been receiving deliveries from the State Water Project since 1962 and about 80% of our water supply now comes from the State Water Project. We depend on the State Water Project to provide a reliable high quality supply. But we recognize that in taking deliveries that that delivery must be done in a responsible manner. That is in a manner that protects and maintains the quality and habitat values of the Delta, as well as being able to convey a water supply reliably. Zone 7 has been a major player in conjunctive use and ground water banking. We know the value of stretching our water supply sources. We continue to emphasize and implement increased water use efficiency within our area. However, we know that we will never be fully independent from the Delta in meeting our water supplies. We

are highly supportive and have been participants in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, because we believe that is our best and maybe last opportunity that we'll have for a long term solution to a sustainable Delta. The BDCP approach to environmental management is much more comprehensive than the piecemeal approach that's been used in the past with regard to Delta habitat protection, and it can stabilize both the water supply and the fish species in the Delta. In evaluating the BDCP, I want to make sure that I've recognized that the BDCP will not address all the stressors of the ecosystem in the Delta, but I think it's important to recognize that there are many stressors and that the impacts of those stressors can be significant. The BDCP will not answer all of those. The overall benefits of the BDCP for water supply reliability, water management, flexibility, Delta water quality, and Delta fishes warrant the development and implementation of the BDCP. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Chair: Thank you. Yeah -- uh -- right up there. Go ahead.

Mr. Moore: Good afternoon. My name is Steve Moore. I'm currently serving as the Sheriff of San Joaquin County. In looking at this presentation, one of the things that seems to be missing from our end is how this

will affect our ability to enforce the laws, not only on the waterways, which there are quite a bit here in San Joaquin County, continue to make sure that the resort type recreational things are continued in the Delta, but on top of that, we also responsible when there is levee failures. So with the projects that are looked out on this presentation, I would like to see an evaluation of possibly how law enforcement is going to be able to continue its original mission. But if you are going to add additional responsibilities to this, how are we going to be able to meet those needs. Currently funding will not be available to do that in some steads. The other would be that -- uh -- possibly a study to decide whether or not it would be better to spend the money to develop and maintain the levees as they currently are instead of putting additional monies into an alternative. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. On deck we have John Banks, Jay Sorenson, and Dave Hurley. Go ahead.

Mr. Nomalini: Donte John Nomalini, another one. Uh -- you heard kind of a technical presentation on the SEQA and NEPA analysis. My concern is with regard to your duty as public officials to protect the public interest and the public trust which you've put up for us is an equivalent of water supply with protection and conservation of the

environmental values of the Delta. That in my opinion constitutes a violation of your public trust responsibility. The export of water from the Delta was supposed to be surplus. You've heard speakers talk about in particular the 5 million acre feet that was supposed to be brought in by the State Water Project to not only provide additional water to meet shortages within the watershed, but to make available the water for the 4-1/4 million acre feet of export. It is not clear under any of the scenarios that we've experienced so far that it's possible to protect the Delta, the fish and wildlife environment, and the uses with the prospect of level of exports. We have been strongly advocating for years that people who evaluate the environmental impact of facilities on the Delta must look at the level of exports. We may very well have to reduce exports to zero except in surplus water years. And of course, if you're not paying attention to the courts that have chastised your fish and wildlife protective responsibilities as being inadequate, then you're not really paying attention to your job. This looks to me like an organized effort to try and circumvent the SEQA and NEPA process for a peripheral canal by setting a narrow focus on your Bay Conservation Plan which equates exports to protection. And I think that's in error, and of

course you will find this challenging that all the way through the process. So I would ask that you broaden that to make it a more comprehensive review of what is needed to protect the Delta and it would appear that it may very well be zero exports if the 5 million acre feet was supposed to come in by the year 2000. It hasn't come in. Logic would tell you State Water Project you can't take 4-1/4 million acre feet. You didn't carry out the plan. Those people that made the plan were maybe not as sensitive as we are today for environmental values but they did attempt to do their responsibility as public officials and of course, we've seen the crash of the pelagic fisheries as an indication that the management that has been shepherded by you and your predecessors has been inadequate. So thank you very much. We'll provide further written comment.

Chair: Great, thank you.

Mr. Banks: My name is John Banks. I'm a member of the California Striped Bass Association. I'd like to speak a little bit historically here, first. Water was originally diverted to support farms and communities basically in Southern California that didn't have enough water for their activities. Now so much water is being diverted that it has become another cash crop for the farmers at the south of our normal

watersheds. And this is at our expense. The only conclusion I can draw from this that if these farmers have water to sell as a cash crop, then they've got too damn much water. Okay. A couple of the reasons -- other reasons that I am against either a single isolated or dual conveyance -- whatever nomenclature you want to put on it, I am afraid that it will increase salinity in our area of the Delta, and we are continually fighting salinity right now, and we don't need more water diversions or water re-routing to lessen the flow and the flushing actions of our natural tides. There will be increased pollution because of the same reasons. There won't be enough water coming down from either direction, north or south, to wash the pollutants out to sea. Or to dilute them. And it will badly impact our natural tidal actions, which traditionally in a watershed have a cleansing and diluting action twice a day. I am therefore, my organization is therefore, solidly against any water conveyance such as the proposed peripheral canals. And we are steadfastly against any other system that will allow more water to be diverted from our Delta. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Sorenson: My name is Jay Sorenson, one of the founding fathers of the California Striped Bass Association. We're approximately a 35 year old organization. And this organization was primarily formed because of things that we noticed that were taking place out on the Delta. And through the years we have seen problems arise with our fisheries, natural resources, wildlife. The beauty and splendor of the Delta has slowly eroded. What I used to call the Sistine Chapel, it was my personal Sistine Chapel because I spent two or three hundred days a year out on our Delta as a fishing guide. I have noticed a drastic decline in all of our endogenous sport fish. One that hasn't been mentioned is the American Chad on the San Joaquin River side of the Delta. Nobody talks about that species. Most of us used to go out and what we called bump Chad out here in the South Delta. That doesn't take place anymore. We've seen salinity levels in the Delta rise. In 1986 it got up to 3200 parts per million out here on the Delta. The No Zone into the Delta was primarily in the Bay. It moved up to Chain Island, and heavens knows where that No Zone now from the lack of downstream flows that need to flush this system out. And most of you are aware of what's happened to our salmon fishery off the Coast of California and Oregon. Talk about a

loss in the economy. Over 3,000 jobs lost. 300 million dollars taken out of the economy. And a good portion of those salmon ply the Sacramento River, and that's the species that we're talking about now that's having the problems. So whatever you decide to do, I want you to make sure that there's a high priority on our fisheries and natural resources out here in the Delta. Because I'm really -- pardon the expression -- damn sick and tired of seeing what I've seen out here take place over the last 40 years. My first experience out on the Delta was in the 19 -- early 1940's. And if you'd seen the Delta then and compare it now, the thing is almost dead. So please, in your considerations and deliberations, I want you to take a high priority on what has been a great part of my life. And not only mine, but a lot of other people that live around the Delta, take care of it. It is only one Delta and we've got to take care of it. Thank you very much.

Chair: Thank you. And just on deck Alex Hildebrand, Randy Fiereni, and Bill Jennings.

Mr. Hurley: Good evening. My name is Dave Hurley. I'm Secretary of the California Striped Bass Association, Stockton Chapter. I also write for two Internet based fishing on a weekly basis as well as a Fresno

Bee fishing report, so I have a good handle on what's going on, what our state water levels are, and trends throughout the year. And throughout the years. This is a hard choice. No one is going to deny that our Delta is in tremendous trouble. In three generations, and I am very astutely aware of this because my great grandfather was a commercial fisherman on the Delta. My grandfather had the opportunity to work as a commercial fisherman on the Delta until 1958, and then there's me. But we've in three generations we transformed the Delta from the largest estuary on the West Coast, to our current crisis where salmon season has been closed for the first time since 1848 in history, and we have a pelagic fish decline. But this isn't -- what you are proposing is not a hard choice. It's really an easy choice. There are some hard choices that have to be looked at and I would really encourage -- I'm encouraged that you're -- all the agencies are working together. At least there is the veneer of you guys working together. But what underneath it may be the story that you can't tell tonight. But there are some very hard choices that I would encourage you to look at. And I -- we've been transferring water south for over 100 years with disastrous results. And we're requesting to be transferring water south again just a different

method. We all know something has to be done, but there are too many issues. But I kind of compare what you're proposing to placing a bandage on an infected cut. Except this cut is down to the bone. Without addressing these hard choices of what's gone against what I consider to be the American Way, and what I mean by that is we the general public subsidized large businesses to great profits and the sad part is most of us don't even know it. But subsidized water going to agribusiness in the south area is an issue that has to be addressed. I think it has to be looked at how important that water is, what the use is, where it's going, what it's being used for, what good that water is doing for society, and then the other issue that really needs to be addressed, is in terms of municipal use. Conservation. I don't hear any part of this particular plan -- of course it was a short overview -- but without addressing those two issues, all you're doing is this same story just a different way of getting the water down to where it is. So I would encourage you as an agency, you do have our public trust. Unfortunately some of the actions that have been taking place recently haven't provided much trust for the public. We are in a situation of crisis, and it would be my hope that the next couple of generations are going to be able to enjoy the Delta as my

predecessors have. So thank -- please take a look at those hard choices.

Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Hildebrand: My name is Alex Hildebrand. I'm a farmer on the South Delta. I am very active on the San Joaquin Farm Bureau, and then on the South Delta Water Agency. Let me begin by endorsing but not taking the time to repeat much of what you've heard from those organizations and others who oppose the canal. And it takes a few minutes to explain it, but a dual facility is just a fraud. It would not work. Let me go back to March 21st when DWR held a meeting to kick off this EIR scoping process. The material handed out at that time, and the remarks of Deputy Director Jerry Johns, made it very clear that this is not really a democratic process that's intended here. They prejudged that the preferred alternative would be whatever comes out of the BDCP. Now that body is an unelected body, unaccountable, and it's steering committee includes nobody from the Delta. It -- and it was all -- and it goes through some motions of any indicating -- it will indicate -- look at something else but it was clear that there was no intention in any alternative to what comes out of the BDCP would be given any serious consideration at all. And I

have an example of that. It said people from within the Delta led by Tom Zuckerman, and by the South and Central Delta Water agencies have proposed specific alternatives which would solve any problems without the canal and all of the havoc that a canal would cost including increased longer stages during floods. The -- also are plunging ahead with this prematurely. The -- it is clear that the -- there has been no analysis -- independent analysis obtained and made public of the increase in salinity in the Delta that would necessarily happen if you build a canal in the Delta. Consequently there is no understanding of the fact that the increase in salinity that the canal would cost would clearly put most of agriculture in the Delta out of business. If the Delta -- if Delta agriculture goes out of business, and the primary maintainers of Delta levees, and that would have to cease then and the levees would become abandoned. In fact, some of the people that are very vocal in this activity, actually proposed that we should abandon the levees and convert the Delta from a channel system to a - an open bay. And I'm not a fishing expert, but I notice that there are no endangered fish that are in the San Francisco Bay. And if you turn the Delta into equivalent

kind of a thing, the same thing would happen to the fish here. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Theorini: Good evening. I'm Randy Theorini, a peach grower from Turlock, a member of the Turlock Irrigation District Board of Directors, and I'm the immediate, past president of the Association of California Water Agencies. ACWA is very supportive of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan process. ACWA has been a leader promoting a comprehensive solution to California's water supply reliability and ecosystem health challenges. Improving the sustainability of the Delta is the key policy priority for ACWA's 448 member throughout the State. We recognize that California cannot hope to achieve a comprehensive water solution without a plan to reverse the Delta's ecosystem decline. Although emphasis is often placed on what we don't know about the Delta, there is a wealth of knowledge already evident from 50 years of experience, and that knowledge is compelling. We know that the 18 Delta levees are becoming increasingly vulnerable to the catastrophic failure due to flood or a moderate earthquake. We know that we are expecting the Delta to meet the needs of the aquatic environment and provide water for the

economy, but it was never designed to do both. We know the key native fish species are in decline. We know that communities are losing jobs and income because their water system is in crisis. We know that the Delta is unsustainable in its current configuration. And we know that the Delta's deteriorating condition imperils species and water deliveries to 25 million Californians and 2-1/2 million acres of farmland. Given these facts, we must conclude that the Delta is in ecological crisis that threatens people as well as the environment. If the State doesn't take action to restore and protect the Delta, the repercussions on the environment and the economy will be disastrous. ACWA represents public water agencies in the Delta and above and below the Delta. Solutions must work for local Delta users, and the entire state. As Delta's solutions take shape, we have to make sure that we protect the interest of those who currently use water in the Delta. That means impacts stemming from solutions -- and there will be impacts -- must be addressed and mitigated. We must also ensure that we do not solve problems at the expense of upstream regions. Local economic interests must be respected along with water rights and area of origin interests. It is imperative that the BDCP process address the key issues concerning

the Delta in an expedited manner. Time is not on our side. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Jennings: Good evening. Bill Jennings representing California Sport Fishing. For text and that we will be submitting written comments, but I'll excerpt a few of them generally speaking. The proposed HCP is the most ambitious and far reaching HCP ever envisioned, coupled with the massive scheme to change the hydrology of the Central Valley. Proposed time schedule is absurdly truncated. CSPA believes the schedule was not only internally inconsistent, but also fundamentally inconsistent which the governor's Delta Vision and the basic Federal and Clean Water Endangered Species laws. The fundamental inconsistency between and HCP with the goal of protecting and restoring listed species and a conveyance plan involving a massive public works project that will change the hydrology of the estuary and its tributary waterways is indeed the plan. It is little more than a Bay Delta Conveyance Plan masquerading as an HCP. As a general principal we do not believe that any HCP should include guaranteed water delivery, and/or changes in infrastructure solutions. HCP should be focused on needed habitat improvements sufficient to

enhance the listed species to the point til they could be Group D listed. We note that consideration of increased guaranteed water delivery or new water diversion to fresh water from the Delta, that would result in increased degradation of water quality are impermissible under the Federal Clean Water Act, and that economic considerations have been found by the courts to be illegal pursuant to Section 10 of the Federal Endangered Species Act. Long term assurances and guarantees are fundamentally inconsistent with any defensible or adaptive management program. One of the reasons the recent Federal by opts were overruled was that scientific staff decisions and recommendations were routinely ignored or overwritten by the Water Operations Management Team. Specifically at a minimum the ERA, EIS must incorporate a comprehensive ecological analysis. No HCP planning should have goals beyond protecting and enhancing targeted species. Must protect tributary -- Delta and tributary waters no matter what. Regardless of cost or consequences. Must identify the areas and species that it is attempting to cover. Evaluate the impacts of meeting the existing proposed water demand to each species covered by the HCP. Identify and evaluate alternative water systems and

delivery systems and prioritize those evaluations on ecosystem water needs. B -- urban water needs and agricultural water needs. Clearly and HCP's first priority must be on ecosystem, followed by urban and agricultural needs. Analyze and quantify the Delta needs. For over a decade DWR and the Bureau have refused to undertake a quantification of how much water this ecosystem actually needs. Sufficient reductions are essential. It must discuss how much water is required for a healthy Delta and how various scenarios on export levels and patterns and timing of upstream diversions will affect targeted species are reiterated. A reduced export alternative must be included and evaluated. Explain how levee improvements, flood plain management, and changes in water circulation and quality will affect each of the targeted species of proposed structural modifications. Provide a detailed analysis of how expansion of wetland habitat and changes in hydrology will affect mercury methylation, and the bio availability and/or bio concentration of mercury, selenium, and other toxic pollutants on the food chain. And I've got one more and I'll finish. All right, so -- describe in detail how the reductions of Delta exports identified in Delta Vision will be accomplished within the California Water Rights Process and

the affects upon senior water rights or holders, junior water rights holders, repairing diverters, and the trust. And I'll just say that the elimination of a similar capacity and the increase in residence time in the Eastern Delta will have enormous and serious water quality implications and they've been pushed under the rug too long.

You're going to have to bite the bullet and examine them.

Chair: Thank you. I have one more speaker card and if anyone else would like to make a comment who hasn't filled out a speaker card yet, let one of the folks know up here at the door. But this last one is Woody Alspa.

Mr. Alspa: Hello, my name is Woody Alspa. I'm not a -- uh -- diploma expert, however, when I was a kid we had a -- our first well we dug was about five feet deep. We had a hand pump, and of course things have changed. I won't go into detail on that. But the reason I'm here is I had a vision -- an idea about a day before this was published in the paper about this meeting. And it's so simple it can be complicated, but not in reality. To raise up the land in the Delta, that would benefit everything. It's got to benefit everything. The levees and so forth and so on. So, in line with this thought, I visited the scavenger recycle place in Stockton and found out what they did

with their so called recycled garbage waste or what have you.

Anything that's worth anything is barreled and shipped off to China and then a mixture of waste and biomass is barreled and then dumped out there. And I say dump -- let me emphasize that -- on -- off of Austin Road. And if you've ever seen it, it's like a war zone out there now. It used to be a beautiful place. There's a lot of pure biomass garbage such as waste from vegetables and such, and over production of certain crops that is wasted. Not to mention, and I forgot to ask about the green bins. That's the lawn clippings and such. They're all dumped out there in the same hole. Now this could be -- you could take one section or an island or whatever terminology you want to use, pump the water out if there's water. You could either mix this biomass in the soil or you could separate a certain amount of the soil, put it in the biomass and then recover it with the existing peat dirt -- peat soil or what have you. And this could be done in stages. And then there could -- that could be flooded so that everything settled down and drained just before the bad winter so we could use as possible a flood control. And have a dam so that at high tide the salt water doesn't come back in. So it would be natural flushing out of the salt water. And this would take

a lot of thought, a lot of product, probably a lot of money, and a lot of people working together. But I think it's a start. You know -- and I think it's so simple that nobody ever thought about it. All that wasted biomass is just going to waste. And we are a biomass -- soil is a biomass that's chemistry, it's carbon, hydrocarbon, very simple. Nothing complicated about it. And just perfect. My time is up.

Chair: Thank you. And John Herrick.

Mr. Herrick: Thank you. My name is John Herrick. I represent the South Delta Water Agency. I'd just like to join in the comments of both Bill Jennings and the two Donte John Nomalini's. Just to make a few brief points, it doesn't seem appropriate to have a co-equal goal and a habitat conservation plan that includes exports. The protection of any level of exports cannot be determined until you determine what it takes to protect the habitat about which the conservation plan is developed. So as soon as you put that in there you've got conflicting goals and that's what Cal Fed did, and that's what ruined fisheries. I'd also like to encourage the process to divulge its preliminary modeling results with regards to the effects of an isolated facility or a dual facility on water quality in the Delta. And to that end, I'm not trying to blind side you, but either December or January I sent the

BDCP a letter asking for the modeling they had done so far on water quality effects, and asked them a number of questions about the assumptions in that modeling. The URS representative contacted me and said, I will answer that if the steering committee directs me to. And I haven't heard anything. So again, I'm not trying to blind side the people here, but this is being sold as a public process, with public involvement and stakeholder involvement. And yet, I can't get the steering committee to answer basic questions about what modeling they've done and what the assumptions are. I hope maybe you can correct that. Anyway, that's all I have. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. Okay, are there any other folks who would like to make comments? Okay, if not then we will go ahead and adjourn this part of the meeting but feel free to stay and talk to folks. We'll hang around for a bit and answer anymore questions you have. Thank you very much for coming.